FIONA WRIGHT
University of Cambridge

Volume 43 Issue 1 February 2016

Palestine, my love:
The ethico-politics of love and mourning in Jewish Israeli solidarity activism

[ab]Jewish Israeli left-wing activists engage in a subversive affective politics when they express love for, and mourn the loss of, Palestinian life. But the affects of love and mourning also bind these solidarity activists to Israeli state violence and sovereignty in various ways, entangling them in the very forms of power they aim to challenge. Loving and mourning the Palestinian Other involves an ambivalent ethics in which the activist subject objectifies the Other, and this objectification is a kind of violence that emerges in the affective becomings of solidarity activism. Activist loving and mourning thus call into question the nature of solidarity and alert us to the difficulty of ethics as troubled relations enmeshed in the violence of politics. [*love*, *mourning*, *solidarity*, *ethics*, *political subjectivity*, *activism*, *Israel/Palestine*]

[dc]In May 2010, an activist group called Solidarity, composed mostly of Jewish Israelis and a few Palestinians, held an event in Tel Aviv.[1] The evening, called "Sheikh Jarrah in Tel Aviv," was part of the group's campaign against the forced eviction of Palestinians in Sheikh Jarrah, a neighborhood in East Jerusalem, and the entry of Jewish Israeli settlers in their place. After the usual mingling with acquaintances and friends from the small and familiar activist community, which made up most of the audience, everybody took a seat, the lights were dimmed, and an amateur video called *Love*, made by one of the regular participants in the campaign, was projected onto a screen in front of us. The video showed, in black-and-white images and to the soundtrack of John Lennon's "Love," a series of photographs of demonstrations in Sheikh Jarrah.

The video barely featured Palestinians, with viewers catching the first glimpse of Sheikh Jarrah residents almost one minute into the video, in the background of a shot of Israeli activists. For the rest of the film, the neighborhood's residents continued to appear in the background and in relation to spectacular moments of confrontation between Israeli police and protesters. It was this imagery—of activists dramatically confronting state authorities—that the film focused on. Thus we mainly saw scenes of activists being pulled apart, carried away, and arrested by police officers, who were unable to quite comprehend or contain the protest and whom the activists mocked, as we listened to Lennon sing about love. What was depicted in the video, then, was not primarily a story about relationships between Israeli activists and Palestinians, but a story about conflict between activists and other Jewish Israelis, a conflict portrayed as a betrayal of the love that should exist between them, a love perverted by state violence.

Such a failure of affective solidarity among Jewish Israelis, and activists' attempts to create loving ties with oppressed Others, form the site of an ethico-politics of radical left-wing Jewish Israeli

activism, an ethico-politics that ultimately betrays the ambivalence at the heart of love as solidarity. Jewish Israeli solidarity activists, as I detail in what follows, appropriate Palestinians as their object in their expressions of both love and mourning for the Other. I consider these solidarity activists within their particular nationalist and colonial context and in relation to broader theoretical perspectives on ethical subjectivity, politics, and social movements. Although militating against state violence, these activists are affectively bound to aspects of Israeli sovereignty in ways that engender an ethical ambivalence in their expressions of loving and mourning. This case thus offers insights into the contradictory, troubled nature of ethics when considered in relation to radical politics. More specifically, I suggest that anthropological attention to social movements' subversive possibilities and new becomings should address their sometimes uncomfortable entanglements with the histories and regimes they challenge, thereby gaining a more critical understanding of the ethical and political subjectivities created and reproduced in activism.

Anthropologists have addressed some of these issues in studying international solidarity activism in Palestine, paying particular attention to how activists, in holding up the Palestinian cause as a global symbol of oppression, erase the specificities of Palestinian histories and experiences of violence. For example, those who travel to "be there" (Stamatopoulou-Robbins 2008, 113) in solidarity with Palestinians often conceal the very privileges that allow them to do so (and leave again) (Pollock 2008). Orientalism and ignorance are frequently involved in such political tourism (Koensler and Papa 2011), as well as, to a lesser extent, Palestinians' sometimes ambivalent or negative reactions to these interventions (Seitz 2003).

These questions are less well considered in studies of joint Israeli-Palestinian activism, for which issues of privilege and the

ethics of solidarity are also relevant. This is because anthropologists have given less sustained ethnographic attention to Jewish Israeli antioccupation activism, and because many of the accounts that do exist emphasize (and celebrate) the novelty and subversive potential of such a politics, particularly in its manifestations since the second *intifada* (uprising), which began in 2000 (Gordon 2010; Pallister-Wilkins 2009).[2] Maia Hallward's (2008, 2009a, 2009b) analyses of some Jewish Israeli and joint Israeli-Palestinian activist groups does acknowledge their asymmetry, but she frames these groups as exemplars of a bottom-up, "this is how peace is really done" activism, as opposed to the disingenuous "peace talk" of formal politics and international diplomacy. In doing so, she neglects how such activism may also be enmeshed in hegemonic power structures.

In contrast, I not only examine the ethical and political questions raised by Jewish Israeli activism but also theorize its affective entanglements and ethical ambivalences. The latter are largely missing from other accounts, including both the scholarly ones cited above and the considerable popular and journalistic literature on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It is by considering activist subjectivity that we can see some of the complexities and contradictions of radical politics in Israel/Palestine, whereas they remain invisible in analyses that echo either activist rhetoric or that of mainstream politics. For, while I certainly observed a hopeful subversion of dominant relationalities in Israel/Palestine, this activism is also intimately bound to the very ethical and political paradigms it aims to challenge. I therefore focus on the affects through which radical activism is tied up in a dominant Israeli politics, in attending to activists' ethical engagements with and through love and loss. Jewish Israeli activists' expressions of loving solidarity, and public and political mourning for the lost Other, constitute an ethico-politics that, though transgressive, also closely

relates to how sovereignty is affectively constituted in the Israeli context more broadly. As I will elaborate, Zionist and Israeli politics often center on a concept of loving Jewish Israeli kinship and on memories of past violence and mourning; the activism studied here is more closely related to these conceptions than is often appreciated. There is an extensive scholarship documenting how sovereign power in Israel/Palestine is maintained and reproduced, but the affective and ethical dimensions that engage even radical dissent in its various forms have received less critical attention.

My argument speaks to other social movement ethnographies, which often share the theoretical concerns as well as political hopes of scholarship on activism in Israel/Palestine. Since the Tunisian uprising in December 2010, and the subsequent wave of prodemocratic and economic-justice movements—from the Arab Spring to the Occupy movement, Istanbul's Gezi Park protests to Athens's antiausterity mobilizations—anthropologists have sought to understand new forms of resistance and an emerging politics that centers on solidarity, relations across difference, and a sense of radical possibility. Of concern, among other issues, have been activists' attempts at creating an alternative "being" through "prefigurative" politics (Graeber 2009) or of "becoming otherwise" (Razsa and Kurnik 2012; Sitrin 2013). The concern with processes of "becoming-other-than-one-now-is . . . through encounters with difference" (Razsa and Kurnik 2012, 240) reflects a broader disciplinary interest in Deleuzian notions of becoming, or becoming otherwise (Biehl and Locke 2010; Hamilton and Placas 2011; Povinelli 2006, 2012), which seem to have proved particularly fruitful for ethnographers of activism who wish to consider how the breakdown of certain subjectivities and the emergence of others might enable people to resist structures of hierarchy and exploitation.

But there is another way of thinking about the "becoming" in which radical activism transforms subjectivities: as an event, rather than a process. That is, becoming is not a process that creates the new but an event that brings incommensurable subjects into relation with one another, such that they defy the sovereignty that makes them incommensurable and thus break down the boundaries of subjectivity (Dave 2012, 2014). Becoming is an event that exposes the violence to which activism responds. Or, as Naisargi Dave puts it, activist witnessing means exercising "a disciplined presence to violence that opens up a death that then compels a new kind of responsible life in a previously unimaginable skin" (2014, 442). The point is not, as in other renderings of becoming, and becoming otherwise, only to celebrate the hope and sense of possibility that these events of becoming may inspire, but to trace the death of certain kinds of subjectivity, a letting go of normative versions of being and relating to Others.

This attention to the relation between becoming and violence requires not only a certain ethnographic focus and sensibility but also a serious attempt to "face history" (von Bieberstein and Tataryan 2013), which was a demand and dynamic of Turkey's Gezi Park movement of 2013, as observers noted (Yıldırım and Navaro-Yashin 2013). Similarly, anthropological reflections on the "Greek crisis" trace the becoming-events of new solidarities in relation to precariousness and vulnerability, physical and structural violence (Papailias 2011). These analyses foreground dispossession, displacement, and the erasure of certain histories within contested public spaces as part of resistance, such that the courage, spontaneity, humor, and solidarities of the movements can be analyzed as forms of becoming only in relation to the violence that engendered these very protests. For example, Eirini Avramopoulou (n.d.), in her analysis of the death of Ali, a transsexual activist whose struggle against cancer coincided with that of LGBT activists

within the Gezi mobilizations, asks what it means to die a livable death, as well as to claim life, within a context in which nationalist, sexist, and homophobic forms of violence have already overdetermined how one might live and demand political presence. Avramopoulou explores, as in Dave's analysis, how a "passionate attachment to a different vision of life" (n.d., 16) may both articulate and challenge forms of dispossession, of dying and killing. The becomings of new or alternative relationalities appear here as fragile moments within histories of meaning and affect, which must be considered in connection to identitarian norms and sovereign power.

I follow this approach to affective and political becomings in studying Jewish Israeli left-wing activists' expression of love and mourning as a kind of solidarity that enacts its own violence. By "violence," I do not mean physical assault but rather "a radical interpenetration of life and death" Dave (2014, 442): a disintegration of subjectivity in the face not only of the Other but of the Other whose suffering or death the activist subject must "be with" in moments of becoming. This momentary affective "being with" constitutes the event exposing the violence that wounds or kills the Other and is therefore also a kind of killing: a killing of the norms and identifications through which the subject ordinarily lives and relates to otherness. An ethical relation is thus also a violent one, an affront to subjectivity and its attachments to Others in the world. I will later return to this analytic of killing, and its relation to the very real deaths that haunt my ethnography, in light of my description of love and mourning as troubled forms of solidarity.

[h1]Situating Jewish Israeli activism

My argument is based on 18 months of ethnographic research from 2009 to 2011 with various Jewish Israeli leftist and antioccupation activist groups and political organizations. I was based in Tel Aviv, where most of the (predominantly) Ashkenazi, secular, and middle-

class Jewish Israeli activists with whom I conducted research live and work. These activists' location reflects their relative privilege not only as Jewish Israelis vis-à-vis Palestinians but also within internal Israeli ethnoclass distinctions along which various approaches to the conflict are typically bifurcated. A distinction between Ashkenazi Jews (of European origin) and Mizrahi Jews (of Middle Eastern and other "Oriental" origin) characterizes intra-Jewish relations in Israel and has played out in the disenfranchisement of and pervasive discrimination against the Mizrahim throughout the state's history (Shenhav 2006; Shohat 1988, 1999). Perhaps surprisingly in light of this classed history, the Ashkenazi-Mizrahi division is often mapped onto a left-right one at the level of national politics, with "the Left" in Israel typically understood as the domain of an Ashkenazi elite. As Smadar Lavie notes, this designation conceals the rather conservative socioeconomic and aggressive military politics of Israel's Zionist Left throughout modern Israel's history and its responsibility for perpetuating the ethnoclass divide; it also erases the history of Mizrahi participation in non- or anti-Zionist mobilizations (Lavie 2014, 54–59).[3] Nevertheless, most of the activists I worked with are Ashkenazi, and attempts to address this or build coalitions with Mizrahi activists often encountered obstacles, including long histories of mistrust and differing political agendas. For example, Mizrahi intellectuals and activists have admonished Ashkenazi leftists for having allied with Palestinian struggles while ignoring the oppression of the Mizrahim, which includes the Zionist attempts to erase Arabic linguistic and cultural identifications within Jewishness (Raz-Krakotzkin 2005). When considering radical leftist activists' discourse of love for the Palestinian Other, then, it is important to recall how otherness and discrimination have been silenced within Jewish Israel itself. Although many of the activists were self-critical

and aware of these dynamics, collectively their activism mostly failed to challenge their own ethnic- and class-based privilege.

Thus the descriptive terms I use in this article—*Palestinian*, *Jew*, *Arab*, *Israeli*, *Ashkenazi*, *Mizrahi*—often conceal the multiplicities and complexities of identity in contemporary Israel/Palestine. While I use these terms both as ethnographic descriptors and for the sake of simplicity, the categories they represent are effects of this sociopolitical context and often appear naturalized in reductive and polarized depictions of Israel/Palestine (Anidjar 2003; Dalsheim 2014). This is particularly important given that "the Palestinians" largely appear in this article as a homogenized category, echoing the articulations of my ethnographic context. Although it is beyond the scope of my research to investigate how Palestinians respond and relate to Jewish Israeli solidarity activism, it seems reasonable to assume that for some it may be the source of much concern and debate, while largely irrelevant for others. Palestinian (often diasporic) intellectuals have criticized the actions of Israeli activists (Alsaafin 2012; Alsaafin and Hassan 2014; Hassan 2013), while West Bank villagers I met during fieldwork often seemed to enjoy and capitalize on cooperating with them. A proper investigation of this question would require ethnographic work with Palestinians across this spectrum.

The Jewish Israeli solidarity activism I examine has its own particular history and set of political vocabularies, which have largely developed separately from Palestinian struggles against the occupation. These can be traced back to dominant political factions and ideologies that developed in the prestate period and in the decades after Israel was established as a state in 1948, particularly in early Zionism's specific kind of socialism as formulated by the Workers' Party of the Land of Israel (later the Labor Party). From the start, ideologies of the socialist Left were deeply embedded in

the nationalist project of building a Jewish state and stabilizing distinctions between Jews and others in the settled territory (Sternhell 1998). The first, more radical movements of the Israeli Left emerged in opposition to the military occupation and settlement of the West Bank and Gaza Strip after the Six-Day War in June 1967, with the Israeli Communist Party and the anti-Zionist socialist organization Matzpen (Compass) clearly opposing the occupation and Israeli colonialism. Apart from these Marxist critics, a largely liberal Zionist Left dominated critical discussion of the occupation until the first *intifada* (1987) and peace negotiations of the 1990s, and was mostly concerned with the morally corrupting effects that being an occupying power had on Jewish Israel. Some groups did attempt to work directly with Palestinians to support their struggle (Kaminer 1996), but these were marginal in relation to most of the Zionist Left.

After the peace process collapsed, and following the bloodshed of the second *intifada* in the early 2000s, Israeli leftist peace activism suffered a dramatic decline, both in the number of participants and public legitimacy. There remains a small and ideologically marginal Left, mostly non- or anti-Zionist, which concentrates on working with Palestinians rather than maintaining Jewish Israel's moral purity. My ethnography addresses this form of activism. Although there are far fewer people who identify with this politics than those who would have previously joined left-Zionist protests, the profound challenge that this politics poses to Israeli nationalism and militarism may be sensed in the attacks—discursive, legal, and physical—on them in the Israeli public sphere.[4] Radical leftist actions in public spaces are regularly met with verbal abuse, spitting, or egg throwing, as well as physical assaults by other Jewish Israelis; mainstream Israeli politicians and media outlets depict non-Zionist leftists as "extremists" and "traitors," and their protests as violent, although they

predominantly are not; and Israeli NGOs that expose state violence or advocate for Palestinians' rights have been subject to public campaigns against their work as well as proposed legislation that would cut their funding from abroad and criminalize some of their activities. Within this highly polarized context, leftists emphasize two central principles in their activism: (1) that Jewish Israeli activists should support and join Palestinian-led protests, rather than focus on their own actions directed at the Jewish public, and (2) that they should "be there," that is, hold demonstrations or engage in direct action not in places far removed from the conflict but rather where political struggles are seen to play out. Such places would include Palestinian areas where people are evicted and houses are demolished, and in which the construction of the separation wall—in fact several different fences and walls running along Israel's border with and mostly inside parts of the West Bank and East Jerusalem, since the mid-2000s—has been a major focus of protest actions.[5] These principles and modes of action became primary in the Israeli non- or anti-Zionist Left with the founding of two groups in particular, Ta'ayush (Living Together) in 2000 and Anarchistim neged haGeder (Anarchists against the Wall) in 2003. The activists discussed in this article, and in particular groups such as Solidarity, broadly followed the modalities and principles of protest and solidarity established by these groups, even if certain ideological differences were locally emphasized and sometimes created rifts among and within the organizations themselves.

[h1]Love as solidarity

The politics of love was strikingly prominent in this radical leftist activism. This was the case even though activists were largely angered by or dismissed the widespread discourses of love, kinship, and loyalty that supposedly bind the "Jewish people," in whose name the Israeli state enacted violent and exclusionary policies. In his documentary film *Bil'in Habibti* ("Bil'in My Love" in Arabic), for

example, the Israeli activist and director Shai Carmeli-Pollak (2006) follows Palestinians' Friday demonstrations against the separation wall in the West Bank village of Bil'in. We witness it all through the eyes of the Israeli left-wing activist who travels to participate in these protests, as Carmeli-Pollak weaves his story of the village's struggle together with images and narratives of friendship, solidarity, and affection. The film ends on a photograph of Rani, one of its Palestinian protagonists, together with the director and two other friends. Carmeli-Pollak narrates, initially in Hebrew:

> [ex]In one of the Bil'in demonstrations after I finished filming, Rani asked me, "What is the difference between 'I like you' and 'I love you'?" I told him that "I like you" is a bit less. "If so, Shai," he said, "then I love you." [*Switches to Arabic.*] I love you too, Rani, and Wagee and Mohammed. I love Bil'in. I love the Palestinian people. (Carmeli-Pollak 2006)

Thus, although Israeli activists are suspicious of Israeli nationalist notions of love and kinship, they enact these notions in an alternative politics of joint Palestinian-Israeli activism. They adopt "loving" the Other whom one is not supposed to love as a way of nonviolently subverting a nationalist and racially segregating Israeli politics, yet this subversion employs the very vocabulary of the politics it contests. When, during left-wing demonstrations, passersby called the activists "Arab lover"—implying treachery and betrayal and casting the activists as outside the legitimacy of the national, Jewish, loving consensus—activists sometimes retorted, "Yes, we do love Arabs!" With this perhaps surprising and unsettling response, the activists claimed to love difference, a claim that we might find curious given how it interpellates its subjects by a framing of love (as unquestioning loyalty) and a naming of difference (the Orientalized "Arab"), both of which the activists

otherwise oppose.[6] A simultaneous affective connection, in loving the Other, and disconnection, in ultimately referring to nationalist and racist politics, seem to coexist in this objectification of the Palestinian, "Arab" Other.

Love as solidarity played out in the mundane rhythms of activism that anchored these more dramatic representations. Acts of solidarity with Palestinians, such as joint protests, direct action, and helping with legal, medical, or other needs, as well as the narrating of such acts—in media reports, personal recounting, and documentary films—were framed as acts of love, affection, and friendship; this contrasted with the medical, humanitarian language of certain NGOs, which emphasized care and empathy. As in the ending of Carmeli-Pollak's film, "love" in this context does not only denote romantic, sexual, or familial love. The Hebrew noun *ahava* and verb *le'ehov* can imply those kinds of love but also affection, friendship, admiration, and respect. Israeli activists mediated their expressions of loving solidarity with *ahava* and *le'ehov*, and sometimes also with the Arabic word *habibi* or its feminine form *habibti*, meaning "my darling" or "my love," as in Carmeli-Pollak's film title and some activist slogans.

Thus, friendships between Israeli and Palestinian activists often involved the sincere commitment and affection we might associate with a feeling of love, despite being complicated by their political context. In moments of crisis, such as when Palestinian families were newly threatened with eviction or the demolition of their homes, activists reacted with shock, sadness, and concern and often responded by dropping work or family commitments to travel to the West Bank to be with their Palestinian friends. In addition to arranging protests, liaising with and paying for lawyers, and mobilizing public campaigns to lobby the Israeli authorities, they would spend time talking, eating with, and staying overnight in the houses and villages of their friends. At these moments, activists

described their engagements not as strategic or even political but as something they "just had to do."

Elad, who had been active with several solidarity groups since the second *intifada*, commented, "I don't have a choice about whether to come or not. If friends need help you give help, it's quite simple." On one such occasion, Elad was crucial in organizing the protest actions that eventually stopped the demolition of a whole West Bank village. He hardly slept for almost a week making sure that the demolitions would not take place as planned, showing that his commitment to the Palestinians he had been working with for years was neither an effortless nor simply a more professionalized kind of activism. Although his affective engagements were not any less real for their inflection by the colonial politics they were formed within, this politics made possible the affection, friendship, and love that formed the backbone of Elad's solidarity with Palestinians. While forming friendships with Palestinians, for example, Elad also lived separately from them in significant ways.[7] Beyond the privileges of Israeli citizenship and the identity card that allowed him to freely come and go from the West Bank, Elad gained a kind of social capital within certain Israeli and international networks through the films he made about Palestinians and through working for one of the Israeli NGOs that campaigned against the occupation. Although his activism had some negative effects, including tense relationships with nationalist family members and feelings of alienation from a broader Israeli public, Elad benefited from his loving solidarity with Palestinian friends while they continued to live with the oppressive restrictions and precariousness of the occupation. This solidarity activism was thus a contradictory and imperfect relation between unequal subjects.

Part of the ambivalence of this love as solidarity can be linked to how the very idea of it emerged from a quite specific Jewish and, later, Zionist Israeli history. A loving Jewish kinship and its

ethnonationalist implications have a much older, and different, history in the idea of *ahavat Israel* (love of Israel). This notion can be traced back to medieval rabbinic literature, in which the commandment to love other Jews connoted a love of God—a love of the divine soul that lives in every Jew. Later, this idea morphed into a preoccupation with ethnic or national community in the context of Enlightenment thought, the secularization of the late 18th and 19th centuries, and Jewish and Zionist nationalism. It then strengthened but also changed into a communal solidarity during and after the mass murder of Europe's Jews during the Holocaust (Kupfer and Turgeman 2014). Cracks in the idea of a Jewish people united by loving sentiment most prominently arose in Hannah Arendt's (2007) famous exchange with Gershom Scholem, whose anger at her analysis and criticism of Israel in *Eichmann in Jerusalem* led him to charge that she lacked *ahavat Israel*, to which she assented. Challenging the nationalist overtones of his accusation, Arendt wrote:

> [ex]You are quite right—I am not moved by any "love" of this sort, and for two reasons: I have never in my life "loved" any people or collective—neither the German people, nor the French, nor the American, nor the working class or anything of that sort. I indeed love "only" my friends and the only kind of love I know of and believe in is the love of persons. Secondly, this "love of the Jews" would appear to me, since I am myself Jewish, as something rather suspect. I cannot love myself or anything which I know is part and parcel of my own person. (2007, 466–67)

It is in this spirit, as a critique of exclusionary nationalism, that leftist Jewish Israeli activists also reject and invert this secularized version of *ahavat Israel*. While the influence of the

international Left's countercultural "make love not war" ethos is evident in many of the articles, fanzines, and posters produced by activists throughout the Israeli Left's post-1960s incarnations (Massey 2002), the particular Jewish Israeli cultural politics of love whose history I trace remains dominant in most. These inversions of a nationalist loving sentiment emerge more clearly still in how activists mobilize an alternative politics of mourning, to whose forms and intersections with Israel's broader affective histories I now turn.

[h1]Mourning and melancholia

On the eve of Israel's 2011 Remembrance Day—the holiday for Israeli soldiers and civilians killed in combat or terrorist attacks—I met with Shira, an activist in antioccupation, feminist, and animal rights movements. We chatted about the "alternative memorial day service" planned by the group Combatants for Peace, an Israeli-Palestinian group of "ex-combatants" who now promote joint struggle against the occupation and militarism.[8] Alongside alternative Holocaust memorial services and other such events, the group's Remembrance Day ceremony had become established as a way for left-wing Israelis to subvert the official Israeli and Jewish calendars and disseminate their messages. Thus, instead of the official ceremony in Tel Aviv's Rabin Square, for which large crowds would gather to watch videos on huge screens of mourning families giving testimonies, Combatants for Peace invited particular activists, artists, and prominent figures to represent an alternative politics of mourning. Shira was particularly interested in the inclusion of one speaker, Moti Fogel, whose presence we both felt might lead to right-wing protests. Moti was a long-standing peace activist sympathetic to Combatants for Peace, but also the brother of Udi Fogel, an Israeli settler who, along with his wife and three young children, was killed by Palestinians who entered their home in the West Bank settlement of Itamar in March 2011. The killings had

been considered a national tragedy, shocking in their brutality, and some commentators (e.g., Altman 2011) used them to describe Palestinians as generally cold blooded and murderous toward Jews. Moti Fogel's appearance at the alternative ceremony, then, was enmeshed in personal and collective affects of grief and loss. As we discussed the situation, Shira related it to her experiences of navigating personal and political imperatives in the last months of her mother's life, during which Shira was called up for military service. In Shira's description, her mother had been religious and right wing, completely different from her daughter both politically and in her relation to Israel. Shira decided at that time to refuse any kind of military service related to the occupation and told the army that she was unwilling to carry a weapon. As a result she was imprisoned for three months. She undertook this action alone, without getting in touch with any of the activist organizations that help young people making similar decisions, because she did not want her mother to know about it. She phoned every evening, was allowed to visit her mother on the weekends, and acted toward her parents as if she were doing normal military service in another part of Israel. After three months, Shira managed to convince the army that she needed to be close to her mother, given her failing health, and completed her conscription with a civil service placement, teaching children in a community center close to her parents' home. She succeeded in fulfilling her army service without lifting a weapon, she reflected, but also without having to "go into any of that" with her mother, who died shortly thereafter.

Based on this experience, Shira said she was unsure about Moti Fogel's decision to take part in the Combatants for Peace service, because no matter the political situation, she could not imagine "using the grief over someone you loved and their memory to do something with which they would entirely have disagreed." Fogel said more or less the same thing during the ceremony, and I

wondered what Shira had made of it but did not have the chance to discuss it with her. Personal grief should not be used for political purposes, Fogel commented, and so he had come to the ceremony not to talk about his brother's killing but about how the Israeli state had come to routinely use the deaths of Israelis—loved ones—for political purposes. This refusal to bring personal grief into one's activism resonated, but also jarred, with my impressions of activists' objections to the Israeli state's penetration into the intimate fabric of their lives. On the one hand, it reflected how their politics was a protest against how Israel's violence and occupation had become so finely intertwined with, and virtually unquestioned in, the lives of most Jewish Israelis, as Juliana Ochs (2010) illustrates in her ethnography of everyday life and security discourses among middle-class Ashkenazi Israelis during the second *intifada*. The activist Israelis with whom I conducted research, in contrast, tried to remain vigilant about militarism, resisting a "sacrificial moral economy" (Weiss 2014) that entices even some of the state's strongest critics to comply with its demands of communal obligation. Unlike the often elite and more conformist Israelis who try to refuse their military service and "to achieve dissent without social and cultural alienation" (Weiss 2014, 132), most of my interlocutors found themselves experiencing, and in many ways invested in, precisely the kind of alienation from other Jewish Israelis that certain relationships with Palestinians entailed. Thus, as in Shira's and Moti Fogel's cases, they explicitly struggled with the militarist logic by which losing a loved one can be a legitimate sacrifice to the state, whether in death caused by war and occupation or otherwise.[9]

Yet this position on the privacy of grief was striking, since public and political mourning also figured prominently in many events I had attended with Shira and other activists. For example, an action by the organization Zochrot (Remembering, in the

feminine form of the verb) on the night of Remembrance Day 2010 remains vivid in my memory. The action was called "I Almost Forgot!" and consisted of putting up posters around Tel Aviv that provocatively reminded the public that the next day's holiday, Independence Day, was the anniversary not only of Israel's founding but also of the Nakba—or the Catastrophe, as Palestinians call it, referring to the displacement and loss entailed in the 1947–49 war and establishment of the Israeli state. As I walked around central Tel Aviv putting up posters with Dana, a member of Zochrot, she told me her brother was killed as an Israeli soldier in the first Lebanon war (1982), and that official dates like this made her feel nauseous. She tried to find the most conspicuous and (she hoped) offensive places to stick the posters, while telling me how she would have to attend the remembrance service for soldiers killed in the line of duty the next morning because it was important to her mother that they go together. She seemed determined to keep the state's politics of remembrance and mourning from engulfing her being on that day as she told me of her anger and pain.

On many other occasions, I joined Israeli activists in solidarity visits to Palestinian families who were mourning in some way—a family member had been killed or imprisoned, or a home or even an entire village had been destroyed. Similarly, many protest events harnessed affects and symbolisms of grief and mourning, about not only people who had died but also frequently lost homes, histories, narratives, and memories, all connected to the dispossession of the Palestinians during and since the Nakba.

This kind of activism pulled together private and public grief, even as it resisted the very same tactic practiced by the state in its appropriation of love and loss and its control of how people die and how those left behind may grieve. Continuities exist, therefore, between the activism I describe and broader Israeli preoccupations with bereavement and commemoration (Feldman 2008; Zertal

2005; Zerubavel 1997). As Ronit Lentin (2010) has argued about Zochrot specifically, such activism, radical and challenging though it is, may reflect Jewish Israelis' obsessive focus on the memory of past violence and its moral implications, rather than an understanding of the Nakba as a form of dispossession and colonialism that for Palestinians is far from over (Lentin 2010; cf. Slyomovics 1998 and Stein 2010). More broadly, this activism's attempts to subvert what many scholars have studied as political community based on particular forms of victimhood (Feldman 2008; Ochs 2006; Stein 2012) and mourning (Gabriel 1992; Handelman and Katz 1998; Lomsky-Feder 2011) draw our attention to how activists' mourning for lost Others may also relate very closely to loss as a nationalist Zionist and Israeli discourse.

In this sense, relating to Others through mourning them may remain tightly intertwined with the violence that harms or kills people in the first place. We can further understand this connection between mourning and violence by closely considering the affect of love and how it can appropriate the Other as object, just as mourning may efface the deceased. This is suggested by Lauren Berlant's (2011a) approach in her response to Michael Hardt's (2011) depiction of love as a revolutionary political affect. Love, Berlant argues, cannot escape the ambivalences of attachment and relations to the world, which involve desire. Like other desirous affects, love involves the inescapable and potentially "cruel" projection of fantasies onto the object-other toward which it is directed (Berlant 2011b). Thinking again of the *Love* video screened at the Sheikh Jarrah event in Tel Aviv, in which Palestinians appeared as objects through which Jewish Israeli activists mediated their relations with state authority, one wonders whether the actions of activists such as Elad might also partake in such phantasmal, and perhaps "cruel," renderings of Palestinian Others

as part of their ambivalent relations with themselves and those identified with the self—fellow Jewish Israelis.

These loving affects differ from liberal multicultural discourses of love for difference (Ahmed 2004, 122–41), since they do not propose a generic or abstract love for difference but rather negate a dominant, illiberal discourse of hatred for an Other conceptualized as enemy (Anidjar 2003). In the Israeli context romantic love between Jews and Palestinians is discouraged and even met with violence—one facet of the so-called demographic war (Kanaaneh 2002; Weiss 2005). Nevertheless, some of the features of the "conditional love" Sara Ahmed (2004) theorizes in the case of British multiculturalism are relevant here. Ideas of tolerance or respect for difference, Ahmed notes, idealize the Other as love object and therefore as what invests the subject with its value. It, like Jewish Israeli solidarity activism, thereby erases or silences the subjectivities of the Other(s), often so that the subject may flourish both materially and in its self-perception. This erasure or silencing sits uneasily with a conceptualization of this activism as a nonviolent relationship of solidarity and love. With such entanglements in both normative Israeli political discourse and in liberalism's inadvertent violence, we may ask what it is about this activism's capacity to "love" and to mourn the loved Other that remains either subversive or ethical at all. Is there anything in these practices of loving solidarity that retains the sense of possibility of moments of becoming otherwise, which anthropologists and activists in other contexts have found so appealing? Berlant concludes that love must be regarded as *un*ethical, given its relation to desire and the narcissism and compromises of the political (2011a, 684).

I propose a different argument, however: that Jewish Israeli leftist activists' love for and solidarity with Palestinians is a relationship that remains ethical even as it is compromised by

violence and politics. This approach engages a notion of the ethical that is more Levinasian—with ethics as a troubled and difficult relation to otherness (Levinas 1981, 1985)—than theorizations of ethics that focus on the relation of the self to itself, which have recently been influential within anthropology (Faubion 2011; Laidlaw 2002; Mahmood 2005; Mattingly 2012; Zigon 2007).[10] As in anthropological analyses of activism that trace its liberating potential, I argue that the loving solidarity of this ethnography is ethical in its attempts to relate differently to otherness and to subvert a dominant political regime. But in enacting an alternative ethical relationship to a particular, excluded Other of the Israeli state, Jewish Israeli activists remain tied up in the oppression of that Other through a dominant symbolic economy of identification as well as the material practices of living and dying that separate Israel/Palestine's various inhabitants. Within this context, the subject's objectification of the Other inheres in the relation between them, even an ethical relation, and is a kind of violence that emerges in the affective becomings of this solidarity activism. Activist loving and mourning call into question the nature of solidarity and alert us to the difficulty of ethics as troubled relations enmeshed in the violence of politics. In what follows I expand on this argument by examining one particular death, its link to different kinds of killing, and the challenge to ethical subjectivity that relations between subjects and Others may pose.

[h1]Protesting grief

On December 31, 2010, the death of Jawaher Abu Rahme, a Palestinian woman from Bil'in, was announced. She had taken part in one of Bil'in's regular demonstrations and reportedly suffocated in the tear gas shot into the village by the Israeli army (*Haaretz*, July 18, 2012). Her brother Bassam had also been killed taking part in these demonstrations when, in April 2009, a tear gas canister hit him in the chest. Activists responded to the news with a

demonstration outside the Ministry of Defense in Tel Aviv. The atmosphere was somber as friends met, hugged, and comforted one another. Some of the demonstrators knew Abu Rahme and her family, some had regularly joined the protests in Bil'in, and some were simply moved, frustrated, and angry.

For a while the demonstration remained relatively quiet. Demonstrators held up signs in Hebrew that read "Murderer in uniform" and "Democracy isn't built on demonstrators' bodies," alongside an Israeli flag painted in red to depict bloodstains. As more protesters arrived and their chants grew louder, the atmosphere became more dynamic and confrontational. Soon the protesters moved to sit on the road and block traffic, remaining there for about an hour, and eight of them were arrested. There was loud screaming at this point, and the slogans changed to "Criminals, criminals, criminals," "Police, police, who are you protecting, you're working with the racists," and "A brave policeman beats demonstrators." The chants were familiar, but the air was more charged than usual. There was a feeling of urgency and rage, unlike at some of the other Tel Aviv demonstrations that were planned in advance—the regular, repetitive protest marches that often felt insufficient and self-indulgent. Later that evening another group of activists went to the home of the US ambassador to "return" the weapons manufactured in the United States and sold to Israel, throwing empty tear gas canisters over the fence of his property. Eleven of this group were also arrested.

With the death of Abu Rahme as well as the arrests, feelings remained high all week. That Friday, the numbers at the regular weekly demonstration in Bil'in were swelled by Israelis who had never been to such a protest before but were persuaded to join by the week's events. I traveled to the demonstration that week in the bus arranged by Combatants for Peace, along with some friends and acquaintances who had not previously been to any of the West Bank

villages' demonstrations, either because they feared for their safety or hesitated over the protesters' actions and the role of Jewish Israelis there. The journey passed much as it had previously: experienced activists shared some words about Combatants for Peace and explained to new activists what to expect and what to do if they were arrested or inhaled tear gas, and a generally jovial if slightly trepidatious atmosphere prevailed among the group. As we climbed across the fields toward the village on the last leg of the journey, someone exclaimed, "It's like the *tiul shnati* [annual school field trip]!" The demonstration itself, despite the usual violence, had a similarly cheerful feel for many of the protesters, who stayed toward the back and did not approach the fence where the confrontations with the army were most dangerous. Instead, they walked and talked among themselves and interacted with children from the village who tried to sell them braided bracelets and tea. After the protest ended, the smell of tear gas and skunk—a noxious liquid sprayed at protesters—remained over the village and some protesters' clothes and faces. One of the bus organizers, Eran, announced that we would visit the grieving Abu Rahme family before heading back to Tel Aviv. We walked through the village and into the courtyard of the family's home, greeted by Jawaher's mother, Subiha, and surviving brother, Samir Ibrahim, and sat down as Eran started conversing in Arabic with Subiha and we were served fizzy juice.

We were quiet as Eran addressed Subiha and the rest of the family in Arabic, with no translation into Hebrew or English. Then Subiha spoke in Arabic, and Eran translated her words into Hebrew. She described what happened to her daughter and to her son before her. She linked their deaths to the building of the separation wall and the taking of land in Bil'in, and the struggle the village had built up in resistance. Finally she spoke of the Israeli guests who were listening to her as her "partners" whose presence was

appreciated and whose solidarity with the struggle and with the family's grief was valued. The group of visiting Israelis sat quietly, solemnly, many seeming not quite sure where to lay their eyes. Then Samir Ibrahim spoke, with similar words of explanation and thanks, and invited the Israelis to join the protests in Bil'in again. The journey back to Tel Aviv was more subdued than the morning trip had been, as passengers chatted quietly or slept lightly amid the lingering smell of skunk.

[h1]Killing the Other

In *Mourning and Melancholia*, Sigmund Freud (1957) suggests that melancholia emerges from the ambivalence of the subject's relation of love for a lost object, turned back on the subject in a narcissistic identification that disrupts the ego.

> [ex]The loss of a love-object is an excellent opportunity for the ambivalence in love-relationships to make itself effective and come into the open. Where there is a disposition to obsessional neurosis the conflict due to ambivalence gives a pathological cast to mourning and forces it to express itself in the form of self-reproaches to the effect that the mourner himself is to blame for the loss of the loved object, i.e. that he has willed it. (1957, 250–51)

While the analysis of melancholia that Freud presents here denotes its pathological nature—to be contrasted to the "normal affect of mourning" (243), in which the obsessively painful attachment to the lost object passes with time—he notes in the essay's conclusion that ambivalence, as a quality of love in general, is present in both mourning *and* melancholia. It is in the ambivalence of both love and loss, and how the subject's relation to the object-other is a particular and contradictory relation to the self,

that Freud's words resonate with this ethnography of love and loss as features of Israeli activism.

In Abu Rahme's death, and the various ways that Israeli activism mourned her, we see again both a radical opening to the life of the Other and the limits of this relationship. The mixture of silences, slogans, and loud and angry protest at the Ministry of Defense, for example, suggested both that the Jewish Israeli activists sincerely felt sad and angry, and that they had transformed the death of an Other into a political statement. The discomfort I sensed when sitting with visiting Israeli protesters in Abu Rahme's family home in Bil'in arose from how we were expressing our solidarity with the grief of loved ones as a moment of protest: making the loss of a Palestinian woman most of us had not known or even met into an object of a broader struggle—not just between Palestinians and Israelis but also among Jewish Israelis themselves.

There is a limit, in other words, to the activist ethics of loving and mourning, a limit to its capacity to recognize (the loss of) Others, because it implicates a broader politics in which both the state and its activist opponents claim Palestinians as objects. Shira's questions about how to be politically true to herself while loving and mourning the loss of her mother, Dana's participation in a disruptive act of public mourning in response to her brother's death in war, Jewish Israeli activists' reactions in the aftermath of a Palestinian protester's death—all these relate, I argue, to the struggle of subjects to ethically relate not only to Others but also to themselves, their families, their state.

These struggles often waver on the edge of subsuming the lives and deaths of Others into what Edna Lomsky-Feder has called "traumatic nationalism" (2011, 582) in relation to Israeli school memorial ceremonies. That is, the pain and sorrow of those who mourn, rather than the remembrance of the deceased, becomes the

central feature of memorial practices, in ways that are echoed even in the most subversive activism against Israeli state violence.

The ambivalence of loss, however, alongside love, is also what lends much potency to activism that deploys these affects, as several scholars have noted. Athena Athanasiou, for example, describes the "intense emotional component of a memorial gathering" of a Serbian Women in Black group whose public and political acts of mourning are "conditioned and structured by a certain disavowedness of anonymous losses" (2005, 41). In basing their ethics and politics of responsibility on the loss of Others whom they do not know, and whom they recognize precisely as *not* known, these women simultaneously name and challenge the limits of what Judith Butler (2009) calls "grievability." That is, they question the conditions and presuppositions under which a life can "matter" or not, under which a life is felt as a loss or not when extinguished. Athanasiou's analysis underlines what Butler makes clear: that what is at stake in the mourning of a lost Other is not only an intersubjective relationship but also the norms and boundaries of a political community within which love or care can be extended and lost lives grieved.

Similarly, when Israeli activists publically display grief, they draw attention to how state violence polices the relation between the living and the dead (Athanasiou 2005, 51–52). At the same time this activism challenges that policing by forging a new relation that is not quite contained by the existing political conditions, "*both* as a self-positioning *and* as a turning to another" (Athanasiou 2005, 52). Both a Levinasian conceptualization of ethics as compromised and difficult, and a Freudian one of the subject's ambivalent appropriation of the object-other, echo how this activism challenges the state's relation to the death of Others but does so through appropriating those Others' deaths.

Here, I would like to return to the notion of an ethical relation as a moment of killing; I do this to trace the connections between the discomfort and difficulty of activist mourning and the promise of new becomings in promoting the idea of loving Palestinians. In her ethnography of queer activism in India, Naisargi Dave (2011) studies activism's relation to social moralities as a play of the becomings of ethical, affective solidarity and the foreclosure of such moments through their connection to existing political norms and socially sanctioned forms of recognition. She asks whether certain lesbian activist subjects, in their search for inclusion, have to "*die* a little" (Dave 2011, 13), sacrificing aspects of life for political recognition and effect. I take inspiration from her analysis when I ask, in relation to left-wing Jewish Israeli activists and their simultaneous affective connections and disconnections with Palestinian Others, do they have to *kill* a little? In the ethical practice of their activism, their relations to and care of certain Others within an eminently political domain necessarily involve a violence toward and foreclosure of the Other that we might interpret as a kind of killing. This is an epistemic violence that stems from the physical acts of violence that activists seek to challenge.

But, crucially, this killing refers not only to how Israeli activists, in proclaiming their love for Palestinian Others, and in their mourning the loss of those Others, appropriate Palestinian subjects in a narcissistic affirmation of the Jewish Israeli self, although I agree with Lentin (2010) that this is partly what is occurring. This killing also refers to how the activist claim to a loving relationship as an alternative to Zionist versions of a Jewish national kinship remains subversive because it posits a relation between the Jewish Israeli subject and the abject Palestinian Other, an Other made enemy who threatens to kill the self (Anidjar 2003; Hochberg 2010). The fantasy of a loving relationship with the enemy-other is thus premised on rejecting a certain "we," as in the

claim "Yes, we do love Arabs!," rejecting a normative Israeli subjectivity that is part of the activist self. In this sense the "killing" of the Other that is involved in activists' relations with Palestinians is also a killing of the self—a kind of suicide, perhaps. The Jewish Israeli subject disintegrates in the loving—and killing—of the Palestinian Other, challenging the very integrity of the Israeli state and polity and its violence toward the Palestinians while remaining utterly entangled in the workings of its sovereignty. Activists both affirm their own subjectivities as Jewish Israeli citizens (and the privileges that come with that citizenship and identity) and simultaneously challenge the basis of this self-other differentiation and the violent politics that maintains it. Solidarity activism here exposes the violence of ethics by basing its rejection of a dominant politics on a relation in which the subject claims the Other as object, even in solidarity with that Other, and even as that subject confronts its own position of privilege.

[h1]Conclusion: A violent ethics

I suggested at the beginning of this article that the anthropology of activism, and its attention to solidarity, benefit from careful attention to the histories of violence that may shape the political becomings about which anthropologists, like others, have been so hopeful. Beyond this general perspective, my study of love and loss in Jewish Israeli left-wing engagement reveals the troubled ways that a subversive affective politics can also be tied up in the forms of power it aims to confront. It therefore complements other ethnographies that situate solidarity and activist commitment as difficult, flawed, and reliant on a pursuit of the sentiments, attachments, and desires that keep activists going even as they often feel compromised (Hermez 2011).

Discussing the Arab Spring, Joseph Massad has claimed that "the role of hegemonic structures of governance is to produce the political affect of love" (2014, 129), but in my analysis it is a love

not only for the regime but also for those persecuted by it that may take part in its very hegemony. It is in the ethical ambivalences and affective entanglements of loving and mourning that the becomings of activism are closely linked to the sovereign power it exposes and challenges. Although subversive and potent, expressions of love and grief for the Palestinian Other also incorporate an appropriation of that Other as object in ways that bind this solidarity activism to prevailing Israeli affective politics. In echoing the nationalist loving kinship as well as the "traumatic nationalism" of the Israeli state, radical leftist Jewish Israeli activism performs a kind of solidarity that is not innocent of normative ways of being and relating to Others.

Although in this ethnographic case violence predominantly emanates from the domain of state and colonial power, it may also be a feature of ethical subjectivities and relations that bear witness to and confront such power. This violence reproduces normative forms of objectifying Others, but it also directs itself back on the subject, whose attachments and identifications break down in the face of radical opening to the Other. The ethics of solidarity activism transform the self through making a claim on the Other, seizing the Other as the object of affective becomings and subjective disintegrations. Ethics, then, could be theorized as a relational or intersubjective configuration that may involve political inequality and violence or domination, and not solely as a subject-oriented process of self-making. Love, and other affects that have been promoted as part of a nonviolent, progressive politics—empathy, care, compassion—may thus warrant some critical attention.

I do not frame love in this way to reject such a politics but rather to question the possibility of imagining it as an untroubled embracing of difference or as straightforwardly nonviolent. In the case analyzed here, practices of solidarity and nonviolence, manifested in affects of love and loss, are troubled and disturbing in

their relation to violence and death. Anthropologists might thus study how activists remain enmeshed in the political subjectivities produced by the regimes they seek to challenge, even in moments of radical becoming. A politics of solidarity, and even of love, may be crucial for any possibility of progressive change in Israel/Palestine, or elsewhere, as state and imperial violence continue to structure and delimit the lives, and deaths, of too many. The forms that solidarity takes, however, and its entanglements with domination and violence, must surely be core concerns for scholars of activism. Indeed it is worth keeping an eye on how relating to and loving Others can also kill them, a little, even as one mourns their loss.

[h1]Notes

Acknowledgments. This research was carried out with the support of an Economic and Social Research Council doctoral studentship, held at the Division of Social Anthropology, University of Cambridge. I am indebted to all those in Israel/Palestine who have generously engaged with me during and since my fieldwork. Versions of this article were presented at the European Association of Social Anthropologists' Social Movements Network meeting in Perugia in October 2013, the "Affects of Activism" panel at the American Anthropological Association meeting in November 2013, and the Social Anthropology senior research seminar in Cambridge in February 2015, and I would like to thank the organizers of and participants in those events for helpful feedback as this work developed. Eirini Avramopoulou, Harri Englund, Toby Kelly, David Massey, and Yael Navaro-Yashin have helped and challenged me to develop this thinking, and I am immensely grateful to all of them for their support. Lastly, I appreciate the careful engagement of Angelique Haugerud, Niko Besnier, and four anonymous reviewers for *American Ethnologist*, which was extremely helpful in revising this piece.

1. Actual names of activist groups and of people in the public domain are used in this article, whereas I use pseudonyms for activists with whom I did research and have changed some other identifying details about them.

2. See Lamarche 2008 and Marteu 2009 for historical overviews of joint Israeli-Palestinian activism. Brian Callan (2013) and Richard W. Clarke (2001, 2003) both engage ethnographically with similar kinds of joint activism but concentrate primarily on moments when Israelis and Palestinians meet and interact, whereas my ethnography focuses on Jewish Israeli activists both in these contexts and in the spaces where they live and work separately from Palestinians.

3. I use "non-Zionist" in this article to refer to the minority of activists who share many criticisms of contemporary Israel with those who define themselves as anti-Zionist, but who take a more ambivalent stance toward Zionism. They often claim, for example, that Zionism has been corrupted, perhaps beyond redemption, by the Israeli state, but that other versions of Zionism used to formulate a vision of binationalism that had more in common with their political position. They thus refuse or defer an identification with Zionism in its present form but do not see it as the root cause of the oppression against which they are working.

4. I know of no reliable source on how many radical or anti-Zionist activists there are in Israel. The surveys that have estimated the size of the "Israeli Left" (e.g., Hermann 2009) are of little relevance, because they are based on formal political affiliations, when in fact no single political party represents these activists, and many of them choose not to vote in national elections. From my observations and interviews, I estimate that there are between 300 and 600 Jewish Israelis actively engaged in the kind of actions studied in this ethnography at any one time. More people participate intermittently or may agree with these activists' politics,

with demonstrations in Tel Aviv reaching up to 5,000 participants on a handful of occasions during my research.

5. These actions mostly take place in East Jerusalem and parts of the West Bank, as well as occasionally in locations within the Green Line (the 1949 armistice line), with permits for entering the Gaza Strip now almost impossible for most Israeli citizens to obtain (see also note 7, below).

6. A similar observation has been made in relation to antiracist activism and supporters of the civil rights struggle in the United States, as certain exoticizations of black culture seem to mimic this fetishization of the Other with whom one works in solidarity (hooks 1992, 24).

7. This is due at least partly to an effective politics of separation, bolstered by pervasive securitization (Ochs 2010). The former is enforced by a system of Israeli permits for Palestinian movement in and out of the occupied territories and the construction since the mid-1990s of a physical barrier separating Israel and the Gaza Strip, and since the mid-2000s of several different fences and walls running along Israel's border with and mostly inside parts of the West Bank and East Jerusalem (Hanafi 2012; Ophir, Givoni, and Hanafi 2009; Tawil-Souri 2011; Weizman 2007; Zureik, Lyon, and Abu-Laban 2010).

8. Combatants for Peace is one of the groups that has been accused by some of promoting "normalization"—the representation of Israelis and Palestinians as equal "sides" in a symmetrical conflict and thus equal partners in building peace, an image certainly disseminated in many projects for "dialogue" or "coexistence." The issue of normalization—what it means, and how it relates to different kinds of joint Palestinian-Israeli activism—is complex and cannot be adequately discussed here. Most of the activists to whom I refer are critically aware of and consciously opposed to normalization, and I do not believe they are engaged in it, since

recognizing the oppression of Palestinians and the need to combat it in all interactions is foremost among their political concerns. In this sense my theorization of the affective entanglements of Jewish Israeli solidarity activists with Israeli state sovereignty is definitively not as a form of normalization, and their work has more in common with what scholars and activists have recently tried to reconceptualize as "decolonization," "coresistance," or "collaborative struggle," among other characterizations (e.g., Svirsky 2014; Todorova, forthcoming). Combatants for Peace is thus somewhat of an anomaly in this research, as many of the activists I worked with admired or took part in their actions out of support for their antimilitarist agenda, even though they were critical of their activities in relation to normalization.

9. On Israeli militarism, see Ben-Ari and Lomsky-Feder 1999; Kimmerling 1993; Levy 2012.

10. Jarrett Zigon's (2013) article "On Love" demonstrates this approach to ethics in considering love as an "ethical demand" prompting a process of self-remaking. My framing of love as an affect that brings subject and Other into troubled relation departs from this conceptualization, which, even though it addresses the risky and self-shattering effects of love, ultimately returns to a redemptive ethical subject capable of mastering its capacities of self-cultivation.

[h1]References

Ahmed, Sara. 2004. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Alsaafin, Linah. 2012. "How Obsession with 'Nonviolence' Harms the Palestinian Cause." *Electronic Intifada*, July 10. Accessed April 1, 2015. http://electronicintifada.net/content/how-obsession-nonviolence-harms-palestinian-cause/11482).

Alsaafin, Linah, and Budour Hassan. 2014. "Exposing the Israeli Left." *State of Hawiya* (blog). Accessed April 1, 2015.

http://stateofhawiya.blogspot.ca/2014/08/part-two-exposing-israeli-left-on-issue.html.

Altman, Yair. 2011. "Horror in Samaria: Terrorist Murders Family of 5." *Ynetnews*, March 12. Accessed June 17, 2013. http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4040974,00.html.

Anidjar, Gil. 2003. *The Jew, the Arab: A History of the Enemy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Arendt, Hannah. 2007. "A Letter to Gershom Scholem." In *The Jewish Writings*, edited by Ron H. Feldman and Jerome Kohn, 465–71. New York: Schocken Books. First published 1963.

Athanasiou, Athena. 2005. "Reflections on the Politics of Mourning." *Historein* 5: 40–57.

Avramopoulou, Eirini. n.d. "Claims of Existence between Biopolitics and Thanatopolitics." Unpublished manuscript. Last modified August 14, 2015. PDF.

Ben-Ari, Eyal, and Edna Lomsky-Feder, eds. 1999. *The Military and Militarism in Israeli Society*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Berlant, Lauren. 2011a. "A Properly Political Concept of Love." *Cultural Anthropology* 26 (4): 683–91.

———. 2011b. *Cruel Optimism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Biehl, João, and Peter Locke. 2010. "Deleuze and the Anthropology of Becoming." *Current Anthropology* 51 (3): 317–51.

Butler, Judith. 2009. *Frames of War: When Is Life Grievable?* London: Verso.

Callan, Brian. 2013. "Something's Wrong Here: Transnational Dissent and the Unimagined Community." *Contemporary Social Science: Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences* 9 (1): 106–20.

Carmeli-Pollak, Shai, dir. 2006. *Bil'in Habibti*. Tel Aviv: Claudius Films.

Clarke, Richard W. J. 2001. "The Politics of Knowledge: 'Understanding,' Reflexivity and Engagement on the Israeli-Palestinian Frontier." PhD diss., University of Cambridge.

———. 2003. "Voices from the Margins: Knowledge and Interpellation in Israeli Human Rights Protests." In *Human Rights in Global Perspective: Anthropological Studies of Rights, Claims and Entitlements*, edited by Jon P. Mitchell and Richard A. Wilson, 118–39. London: Routledge.

Dalsheim, Joyce. 2014. *Producing Spoilers: Peacemaking and the Production of Enmity in a Secular Age*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dave, Naisargi. 2011. "Activism as Ethical Practice: Queer Politics in Contemporary India." *Cultural Dynamics* 23 (1): 3–20.

———. 2012. *Queer Activism in India: A Story in the Anthropology of Ethics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

———. 2014. "Witness: Humans, Animals, and the Politics of Becoming." *Cultural Anthropology* 29 (3): 433–56.

Faubion, James D. 2011. *An Anthropology of Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Feldman, Jackie. 2008. *Above the Death Pits, beneath the Flag: Youth Voyages to Poland and the Performance of Israeli National Identity*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Freud, Sigmund. 1957. "Mourning and Melancholia." In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, vol. 14, edited by James Strachey, Anna Freud, Alix Strachey, and Alan Tyson, 243–58. London: Hogarth Press.

Gabriel, Ayala. 1992. "Grief and Rage: Collective Emotions in the Politics of Peace and the Politics of Gender in Israel." *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry* 16 (3): 311–35.

Gordon, Uri. 2010. "Against the Wall: Anarchist Mobilization in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict." *Peace and Change* 35 (3): 412–33.

Graeber, David. 2009. *Direct Action: An Ethnography*. Edinburgh: AK Press.

Hallward, Maia. 2008. "Negotiating Boundaries, Narrating Checkpoints: The Case of Machsom Watch." *Critique: Critical Middle Eastern Studies* 17 (1): 21–40.

———. 2009a. "Building Space for Peace? Israeli and Palestinian Activism in the Second Intifada." *Global Change, Peace and Security* 21 (3): 309–23.

———. 2009b. "Creative Responses to Separation: Israeli and Palestinian Joint Activism in Bil'in." *Journal of Peace Research* 46 (4): 541–58.

Hamilton, Jennifer A., and Aimee J. Placas. 2011. "Anthropology Becoming . . .? The 2010 Sociocultural Anthropology Year in Review." *American Anthropologist* 113 (2): 246–61.

Hanafi, Sari. 2012. "Explaining Spacio-cide in the Palestinian Territory: Colonization, Separation, and State of Exception." *Current Sociology* 61 (2): 190–205.

Handelman, Don, and Elihu Katz. 1998. "State Ceremonies of Israel—Remembrance Day and Independence Day." In *Models and Mirrors: Towards an Anthropology of Public Events*, edited by Don Handelman, 191–233. New York: Berghahn Books.

Hardt, Michael. 2011. "For Love or Money." *Cultural Anthropology* 26 (4): 676–82.

Hassan, Budour. 2013. "The Colour Brown: De-colonising Anarchism and Challenging White Hegemony." *Random Shelling* (blog), July 24. Accessed April 1, 2015. https://budourhassan.wordpress.com/2013/07/24/the-colour-brown-de-colonising-anarchism-and-challenging-white-hegemony.

Hermann, Tamar. 2009. *The Israeli Peace Movement: A Shattered Dream*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hermez, Sami. 2011. "Activism as 'Part-Time': Searching for Commitment and Solidarity in Lebanon." *Cultural Dynamics* 23 (1): 41–55.

Hochberg, Gil. 2010. *In Spite of Partition: Jews, Arabs, and the Limits of Separatist Imagination*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

hooks, bell. 1992. *Black Looks: Race and Representation*. Boston: South End Press.

Kaminer, Reuven. 1996. *The Politics of Protest: The Israeli Peace Movement and the Palestinian Intifada*. Brighton, UK: Sussex Academic Press.

Kanaaneh, Rhoda A. 2002. *Birthing the Nation: Strategies of Palestinian Women in Israel*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kimmerling, Baruch. 1993. "Patterns of Militarism in Israel." *European Journal of Sociology* 34 (2): 196–223.

Koensler, Alexander, and Cristina Papa. 2011. "Political Tourism in the Israeli-Palestinian Space." *Anthropology Today* 27 (2): 13–17.

Kupfer, Shira, and Asaf Turgeman. 2014. "The Secularization of the Idea of *Ahavat Israel* and Its Illumination of the Scholem-Arendt Correspondence on *Eichmann in Jerusalem*." *Modern Judaism* 34 (2): 188–209.

Laidlaw, James. 2002. "For an Anthropology of Ethics and Freedom." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 8 (2): 311–32.

Lamarche, Karin. 2008. "Des 'mouvements pacifistes' aux 'mouvements anti-occupation' israéliens." *Bulletin du Centre de recherche français à Jérusalem* 19 (August): 1–13.

Lavie, Smadar. 2014. *Wrapped in the Flag of Israel: Mizrahi Single Mothers and Bureaucratic Torture*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Lentin, Ronit. 2010. *Co-memory and Melancholia: Israelis Memorialising the Palestinian Nakba*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Levinas, Emmanuel. 1981. *Otherwise Than Being: Or beyond Essence*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

———. 1985. *Ethics and Infinity*. Edited by Philippe Nemo. Translated by Richard A. Cohen. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Levy, Yagil. 2012. *Israel's Death Hierarchy: Casualty Aversion in a Militarized Democracy*. New York: New York University Press.

Lomsky-Feder, Edna. 2011. "Competing Models of Nationalism: An Analysis of Memorial Ceremonies in Schools." *Nations and Nationalism* 17 (3): 581–603.

Mahmood, Saba. 2005. *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Marteu, Elizabeth. 2009. *Civil Organizations and Protest Movements in Israel: Mobilization around the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Massad, Joseph. 2014. "Love, Fear and the Arab Spring." *Public Culture* 26 (1): 127–51.

Massey, David. 2002. *It's All Lies: The Fusion of Resistance and Creativity in Israel—Leaflets, Underground Press and Posters.* Tel Aviv: APICC.

Mattingly, Cheryl. 2012. "Two Virtue Ethics and the Anthropology of Morality." *Anthropological Theory* 12 (2): 161–84.

Ochs, Juliana. 2006. "The Politics of Victimhood and Its Internal Exegetes: Terror Victims in Israel." *History and Anthropology* 17 (4): 355–68.

———. 2010. *Security and Suspicion: An Ethnography of Everyday Life in Israel*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ophir, Adi, Michal Givoni, and Sari Hanafi. 2009. *The Power of Inclusive Exclusion: Anatomy of Israeli Rule in the Occupied Palestinian Territories*. New York: Zone Books.

Pallister-Wilkins, Polly. 2009. "Radical Ground: Israeli and Palestinian Activists and Joint Protest Against the Wall." *Social Movement Studies* 8 (4): 393–407.

Papailias, Penelope. 2011. "Beyond the 'Greek Crisis.'" *Cultural Anthropology Online*, October 10. Accessed February 14, 2015. http://www.culanth.org/fieldsights/243-beyond-the-greek-crisis-histories-rhetorics-politics.

Pollock, Mica. 2008. "Using and Disputing Privilege: Young U.S. Activists Struggling to Wield 'International Privilege' in Solidarity." *Race/Ethnicity: Multidisciplinary Global Contexts* 1 (2): 227–51.

Povinelli, Elizabeth A. 2006. *The Empire of Love: Toward a Theory of Intimacy, Genealogy, and Carnality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

———. 2012. "The Will to Be Otherwise/The Effort of Endurance." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 111 (3): 453–75.

Raz-Krakotzkin, Amnon. 2005. "The Zionist Return to the West and the Mizrahi Jewish Perspective." In *Orientalism and the Jews*, edited by Derek J. Penslar and Ivan D. Kalmar, 162–81. Lebanon, NH: Brandeis University Press.

Razsa, Maple, and Andrej Kurnik. 2012. "The Occupy Movement in Žižek's Hometown: Direct Democracy and a Politics of Becoming." *American Ethnologist* 39 (2): 238–58.

Seitz, Charmaine. 2003. "ISM at the Crossroads: The Evolution of the International Solidarity Movement." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 32 (4): 50–67.

Shenhav, Yehouda A. 2006. *The Arab Jews: A Postcolonial Reading of Nationalism, Religion, and Ethnicity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Shohat, Ella. 1988. "Sephardim in Israel: Zionism from the Standpoint of Its Jewish Victims." *Social Text* 19–20 (Autumn): 1–35.

———. 1999. "The Invention of the Mizrahim." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 29 (1): 5–20.

Sitrin, Marina. 2013. "Occupy Trust: The Role of Emotion in the New Movements." *Cultural Anthropology Online*. Accessed February 2, 2015. http://www.culanth.org/fieldsights/76-occupy-trust-the-role-of-emotion-in-the-new-movements.

Slyomovics, Susan. 1998. *The Object of Memory: Arab and Jew Narrate the Palestinian Village*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Stamatopoulou-Robbins, Sophia. 2008. "The Joys and Dangers of Solidarity in Palestine: Prosthetic Engagement in an Age of Reparations." *CR: The New Centennial Review* 8 (2): 111–60.

Stein, Rebecca. 2010. "Israeli Routes through Nakba Landscapes: An Ethnographic Meditation." *Jerusalem Quarterly* 43 (Autumn): 6–17.

———. 2012. "Impossible Witness: Israeli Visuality, Palestinian Testimony and the Gaza War." *Journal for Cultural Research* 16 (2–3): 135–53.

Sternhell, Zeev. 1998. *The Founding Myths of Israel: Nationalism, Socialism, and the Making of the Jewish State*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Svirsky, Marcelo. 2014. "On the Study of Collaborative Struggles in Settler Societies." *Settler Colonial Studies* 4 (4): 434–49.

Tawil-Souri, Helga. 2011. "Colored Identity: The Politics and Materiality of ID Cards in Palestine/Israel." *Social Text* 29 (2): 67–97.

Todorova, Teodora. Forthcoming. "Reframing Bi-nationalism in Palestine-Israel as a Process of Settler Decolonisation."

Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography. doi:10.1111/anti.12153.

von Bieberstein, Alice, and Nora Tataryan. 2013. "The What of Occupation." *Cultural Anthropology Online*, October 31. Accessed February 16, 2015. http://www.culanth.org/fieldsights/394-the-what-of-occupation-you-took-our-cemetery-you-won-t-have-our-park.

Weiss, Erica. 2014. *Conscientious Objectors in Israel: Citizenship, Sacrifice, Trials of Fealty*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Weiss, Meira. 2005. *The Chosen Body: The Politics of the Body in Israeli Society*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Weizman, Eyal. 2007. *Hollow Land: Israel's Architecture of Occupation*. London: Verso.

Yıldırım, Umut, and Yael Navaro-Yashin, eds. 2013. "An Impromptu Uprising: Ethnographic Reflections on the Gezi Park Protests in Turkey." Article collection, *Cultural Anthropology Online*, October 31. Accessed February 16, 2015. http://www.culanth.org/fieldsights/391-an-impromptu-uprising-ethnographic-reflections-on-the-gezi-park-protests-in-turkey.

Zertal, Idith. 2005. *Israel's Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zerubavel, Yael. 1997. *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zigon, Jarrett. 2007. "Moral Breakdown and the Ethical Demand: A Theoretical Framework for an Anthropology of Moralities." *Anthropological Theory* 7 (2): 131–50.

———. 2013. "On Love: Remaking Moral Subjectivity in Postrehabilitation Russia." *American Ethnologist* 40 (1): 201–15.

Zureik, Elia, David Lyon, and Yasmeen Abu-Laban, eds. 2010. *Surveillance and Control in Israel/Palestine: Population, Territory and Power*. New York: Routledge

Fiona Wright
Division of Social Anthropology
University of Cambridge
Free School Lane, Cambridge CB2 3RF
United Kingdom

fcw28@cam.ac.uk

[Caption for Graphical TOC]

In a still from Yoav Peled's short film *Love*, Jewish Israeli left-wing activists clash with police and right-wing settlers in Sheikh Jarrah, East Jerusalem, in 2010. (Courtesy of Yoav Peled)